



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,966	03/19/2001	Stephane Herman Maes	YOR9-2000-794US1 (8728-46)	9282

7590 07/12/2004

Frank Chau, Esq.  
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP  
Suite 501  
1900 Hempstead Turnpike  
East Meadow, NY 11554

EXAMINER

REFAI, RAMSEY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

3

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/811,966

Applicant(s)

MAES ET AL.

Examiner

Ramsey M Refai

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "web server 114" in paragraph [0043] will be taken as "web server 112".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-9, 11, 18-20, 22-25, 27-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mighdoll et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168)

5. As per claim 1, Mighdoll et al teach a network environment that includes a plurality of nodes and that uses a markup language to create documents, a method for filtering the documents, comprising the steps of:

upon receiving a request from a requesting node among the plurality of nodes (column 5, lines 49 - 57 and Figure 5, 501),

constructing an input Document Object Model (DOM) based on a document corresponding to the request (column 5, lines 57 - 60),

storing the input DOM (abstract, line 5-8);

identifying elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored (column 6, line 20 - column 7, line 13 and column 12, lines 23 - 31); and

filtering the input DOM to obtain a filtered DOM, based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to the input DOM (abstract, lines 5 - 16 and Figure 7).

6. As per claim 2, Mighdoll et al teach a method comprising the step of sending the filtered DOM to the requesting node (Figure 6, 608).

7. As per claim 3, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein said filtering step filters out previously received content from the filtered DOM based upon the identified elements (column 12, lines 1- 15).

8. As per claim 4, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein said filtering step filters out non-relevant content from the filtered DOM with respect to at least one of the request and at least one previous request (column 12, lines 16-31).

9. As per claim 5, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein said filtering step comprises the step of identifying at least one of relevant content and the non-relevant content with respect to the identified elements (column 12, lines 1-31; the non-relevant content being the cached version of document and relevant content being the newly-retrieved document).

10. As per claim 6, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the step of identifying changed data with respect to at least two interactions between the requesting node and another node from among the plurality of nodes (column 12, lines 1-31; first interaction being the original request for document, second interaction being the second document request).

11. As per claim 7, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein said filtering step comprises the step of including only the changed data in the filtered DOM (column 12, lines 24 – 27).

12. As per claim 8, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the at least one pre-specified rule comprises removing previously received content from the input DOM, (column 12, lines 1-15; previously cached version of document is replaced) when at least one client device has at least one pre-specified limited resource (abstract, lines 12-16).

13. As per claim 9, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the at least one pre-specified limited resource comprises at least one of a bandwidth, a memory capacity, a processing ability, and a display screen area, less than a pre-defined threshold (abstract, lines 12-16).

14. As per claim 11, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein at least one pre-specified rule comprises removing non-relevant content from the input DOM (column 12, lines 1-15; previously cached version of document is replaced) when the at least one client device has at least one pre-specified limited resource (abstract, lines 12-16).

15. As per claim 18, Mighdoll et al teach method wherein; filtering step comprises the step of removing presentational markup from DOM (column 7. lines 15-29; transcoder rewrites certain portion of code which inherently include removing code).

16. As per claim 19, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein said storing step stores the input DOM in a cache, and said identifying step identifies the elements of the input DOM that have previously been cached (column 5, line 40 – column 6, line 6 and column 11, line 50 - column 12, line 15).

17. As per claim 20, Mighdoll et al teach a method implemented by a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform said method steps (column 17, line 29- column 18, line 10 and column 19, line 10- column 20, line 32).

18. As per claim 22, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes a client device, and the requesting node is the client device (column 16, line 51 – 67).

19. As per claim 23, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device, at least one server, (column 16, line 51 – 67) and at least one intermediary coupled there between, and the requesting node is an intermediary (column 16, line 51 – column 17, line 22; proxy server).

20. As per claim 24, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device and at least one server, the requesting node is a client device and the other node is the at least one server (column 16, line 51 – 67).

21. As per claim 25, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device, at least one server (column 16, line 51 – 67), and at least one intermediary coupled there between, the requesting node is a client device or an intermediary and the other node is a server or another intermediary (column 16, line 51 – column 17, line 22; proxy server).

22. As per claim 27, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device, at least one server (column 16, line 51 – 67), and at least one intermediary coupled there between, and said

filtering step is performed by the at least one intermediary (column 16, line 51 – column 17, line 22; proxy server).

23. As per claim 28, Mighdoll et al teach a system for filtering markup language documents in a client/server environment having at least one client device and at least one server, said system comprising:

an intermediary operatively coupled between the at least one client device and the at least one server, adapted to receive a request sent from the at least one client device or from another intermediary, and to receive a document corresponding to the request (column 18, line 10 – 48; proxy server);

a filter operatively coupled to said intermediary, adapted to build an input document object model (DOM) based on the document (column 16, line 51 – column 17, line 22; proxy server), and filter the input DOM to output a filtered DOM based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to the input DOM (abstract, lines 5 – 16 and Figure 7); and

a differential DOM coder operatively coupled to at least one client device and the intermediary, adapted to receive the filtered DOM and to identify and output at least changed data with respect to the input DOM and the filtered DOM (column 7, line 15-56; transcoder).

24. As per claim 29, Mighdoll et al teach a system for filtering markup language documents in a client/server environment having at least one client device and at least one server, said system comprising:

an intermediary operatively coupled between the at least one client device and the at least one server, adapted to receive a request from the at least one client device or another



intermediary, receive a document corresponding to the request (column 18, line 20 - 31; proxy server), and to output a filtered document object model (DOM) to the at least one client device or the other intermediary (column 18, lines 40-48);

a storage device operatively coupled to said intermediary, adapted to store an input DOM, and identify elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored (column 11, line 55 – column 12, line 15; proxy cache); and

a filter operatively coupled to said storage device and said intermediary or the other intermediary, adapted to build the input DOM based on the document, and filter the input DOM to obtain the filtered DOM (column 11, line 55 – column 12, line 15) based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to at least one of the input DOM and the identified elements (abstract, lines 5 – 16 and Figure 7).

25. As per claim 30, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein at least one of said storage device and said filter is disposed within said intermediary, the other intermediary, or a combination thereof (column 11, line 50 – 67; cache on proxy server) .

26. As per claim 31, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein said storage device is further adapted to track a history of user interaction (column 11, line 55-67).

27. As per claim 32, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein the history of user interaction comprises a World Wide Web (WWW) page visited during a given interactive session (column 11, line 55-67).

28. As per claim 33, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein said storage device is a cache (column 11, line 55-67).

29. As per claim 34, Mighdoll et teach a system wherein said filter is adapted to filter the input DOM so as to remove previously received content there from (column 11, line 55 – column 12, line 15).

30. As per claim 35, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein said filter is adapted to filter the input DOM so as to remove non-relevant content therefrom with respect to at least one of the request and at least one previous request (column 12, lines 16-31).

31. As per claim 37, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein said filter is adapted to filter the input DOM one of prior to, during, and after transcoding at least one page corresponding to the input DOM (column 11, line 55 – column 12, line 15).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

32. Claims 10,12, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mighdoll et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kanevsky et al (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0065658).

33. As per claim 10, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein the at least one pre-specified rule comprises removing previously received content from the input DOM (column 12, lines 1-15; previously cached version of document is replaced).

34. Mighdoll et al fail to teach a method when a user of the at least one client device is one of seeing and hearing impaired.

35. However, Kanevsky et al teach a system that provides web page content to users with special needs (paragraph [0018]) wherein the user is hearing impaired (paragraph [0012]) or blind (paragraph [0011]).

36. As per claim 12, Mighdoll et al teach a method wherein at least one pre-specified rule comprises removing non-relevant content from the input DOM (column 12, lines 1-15; previously cached version of document is replaced).

37. Mighdoll et al fail to teach a method when a user of the at least one client device is one of seeing and hearing impaired.

38. However, Kanevsky et al teach a system that provides web page content to users with special needs (paragraph [0018]) wherein the user is hearing impaired (paragraph [0012]) or blind (paragraph [0011]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Kanevsky et al

to create a method for filtering web documents to people with special needs because doing so would allow users with special needs to receive documents that have been specially tailored to their needs.

39. As per claim 36, Mighdoll et al fail to show a system wherein said client device further comprises a speech synthesis system adapted to audibly reproduce an audio signal corresponding to the filtered DOM .

40. However , Kanevsky et al show the use of a text-to-speech synthesizer to translate text from web pages to speech (column paragraph [0011]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Kanevsky et al to create a system that filters documents wherein the client device comprises a speech synthesis system because doing so would provide blind people the ability to know what a webpage contains by listening to a translation of the webpage in an audio signal.

41. Claims 13-15, 17 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mighdoll et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Berstis et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,458).

42. As per claim 13, Mighdoll et al fail to show a method comprising the step of inserting a first identifier in the filtered DOM to indicate a filtered status.

43. However, Berstis et al show a method of labeling websites that have been screened from objectionable content (column 13, lines 33-53; websites can be labeled as containing sex, nudity, violence, or offensive language). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Berstis et al to create a method for filtering documents and then inserting an identifier that identifies that the present document has been filtered. Doing so would allow parents the ability to determine if a particular website has objectionable material.

44. As per claims 14 and 17, Mighdoll et al fail to show a method comprising the step of inserting a second identifier in the filtered DOM to indicate a source document from which the filtered DOM originated wherein the second identifier is a Uniform Resource Locator (URL).

45. However, Berstis et al show a method of inserting a URL of the rating service that produced the filtered document (column 13, lines 25-32). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Berstis et al to create a method for filtering documents and then inserting an identifier to indicate the source of the filtered document. Doing so would allow for users to know where the document was filtered in order to determine the quality of the filtering service.

46. As per claim 15, Mighdoll et al fail to show a method wherein the first and the second identifiers are comprised in a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) extension header.

47. However, Berstis et al show a method wherein the labels are HTTP headers (column 14, lines 59-67). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Berstis et al to create a method for filtering documents and then inserting an identifier comprised in a HTTP extension header because doing so would allow the identifier to be displayed on a website for users to view using a browser.

48. As per claim 26, Mighdoll et al show a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment and the plurality of nodes includes a client device (column 16, line 51 – 67).

49. Mighdoll et al fail to show a method wherein filtering step is performed by the client device.

50. However, Berstis et al show a method for filtering content of a web paged solely as a function of the web browser (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include a method for filtering documents where the filtering step is performed by the client device because doing so would allow the user to set preference parameters that filter content appropriate for the user's needs.

51. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mighdoll et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168) as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Berstis et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,458), and further in view of "Official Notice".

52. Mighdoll et al fail to show a method wherein the first and the second identifiers are comprised in a transport layer for Wireless Application Protocol (WAP).

53. Berstis et al show a method wherein the labels are HTTP headers (column 14, lines 59-67).

54. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantage of using a Wireless Application Protocol is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Berstis et al to create a method for filtering documents and then inserting an identifier that identifies that the present document has been filtered. Doing so would allow parents the ability to determine if a particular website has objectionable material.

55. Claims 21, 38 - 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mighdoll et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,168) as applied to claim 29 above, in view of Boloker et al (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0194388).

56. As per claim 21, Mighdoll et al show a method wherein the markup language is Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) and the input DOM and filtered DOM are pseudo DOMs.

57. Mighdoll et al fails to show the use of extensible Markup Language (XML).

58. However, Boloker et al shows the use of XML documents (paragraphs [0024] and [0150]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include a method of filtering documents wherein the markup language is extensible Markup Language (XML) because it lets Web developers and designers create tags

that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the older HTML document coding system.

59. As per claim 38, Mighdoll et al teach a system wherein the at least one page comprises at least one HTML page and said filter is further adapted to filter the input DOM prior to transcoding the at least one HTML page to at least one target presentation page or prior to transcoding the at least one HTML page to at least one synchronized page (column 11, line 55 – column 12, line 15).

60. Mighdoll et al fails to show the use of extensible Markup Language (XML) or a system in a multi-channel application or in a multi-modal mode.

61. However Boloker et al shows a system with a multi-modal browser (paragraph [002]), mutely-channels applications (paragraph [0072]) and the use of XML documents (paragraph [0024] and [0150]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Boloker et al to create a system for filtering markup language documents wherein the input DOM is an XML page and in a multi-modal or multi-channel modes because doing so would allow which allow a user to interact in parallel with the same information via a multiplicity of channels and user interfaces, while presenting a unified, synchronized view of information across the various channels.

62. As per claim 39 - 41, Mighdoll et al and Berstis et al fail to show a system wherein the input DOM is in a multi-channel mode, a multi-modal mode and a channel/modality independent mode.



63. However, Boloker et al show a system with a multi-modal browser (paragraph [002]), mutely-channels applications (paragraph [0072]) and in a channel/modality independent modes (paragraph [0073]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mighdoll et al and Boloker et al to create a system for filtering markup language documents wherein the input DOM is in a multi-modal or multi-channel modes because doing so would allow which allow a user to interact in parallel with the same information via a multiplicity of channels and user interfaces, while presenting a unified, synchronized view of information across the various channels.

64. As per claim 42, Mighdoll et al and Berstis et al fail to show a system wherein the filtered DOM includes at least one of speech, Wireless Markup Language (WML), Voice eXtensible Markup Language (VoiceXML), and Conversational Markup Language (CML).

65. However, Boloker et al show the use of Voice eXtensible Markup Language (VoiceXML) for communicating information over a network (paragraph [0008-0009]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include a system of filtering documents wherein the markup language is Voice extensible Markup Language (VoiceXML) because it would provide a system to filter web pages that are tailored to users with disabilities to the appropriate user.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey M Refai whose telephone number is (703) 605-4361. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramsey M Refai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2154

RMR  
June 25, 2004

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100